Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 28
Entered: May 7, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AXON ENTERPRISE, INC., DEDRONE HOLDINGS, INC., and SKYDIO, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

AIRSPACE SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00525 (Patent 10,713,959 B2)[1]
IPR2025-00530 (Patent 10,249,199 B2)
IPR2025-00629 (Patent 10,514,711 B2)

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, BARRY L. GROSSMAN, and SCOTT C. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER

[1] This Revised Scheduling Order applies to each of the listed cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Revised Scheduling Order to be docketed in each case. The Parties, however, are not authorized to use this caption for any subsequent papers.

A. REVISED MOTION TO AMEND

1. Introduction

On April 20, 2026, Patent Owner filed revised motions to amend ("revised MTAs") in accordance with our Scheduling Order (Paper 14[2]) and the Board's rule on revised motions to amend (MTAs). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(f). In accordance with our rule and current motion to amend practice, we revise the original Scheduling Order to extend remaining briefing deadlines based on the date Patent Owner filed its revised MTAs. *See id*; 89 Fed. Reg. 76,421 ("the Office will continue to apply the existing timelines by default as currently implemented under the MTA pilot program unless an extension is granted.").

In particular, this Revised Scheduling Order adds DUE DATES RMTA1 and RMTA2 and modifies and supersedes DUE DATE 4 and subsequent due dates as presented in our original Scheduling Order. Further, this Revised Scheduling Order supplements the instructions provided in our original Scheduling Order, including those discussing the content of the briefing related to the revised MTAs. To the extent that our original Scheduling Order provides instructions that are not addressed in this Revised Scheduling Order, the original instructions remain in effect.

2. Evidence and Depositions

Generally speaking, new evidence (including declarations) may be submitted with every paper related to the revised MTAs, except sur-replies. Specifically, both Petitioner's oppositions to the revised MTAs and Patent

[2] We cite to papers filed in IPR2025-00525. Similar papers were filed in IPR2025-00530 and IPR2025-00629.

Owner's replies to those oppositions may be accompanied by new evidence that responds to issues raised in the preliminary guidance (if provided) or in the corresponding revised MTA or opposition. Petitioner's sur-replies may not be accompanied by new evidence other than deposition transcripts of the cross-examination of any reply witness, if relevant to the arguments made in the corresponding reply brief.

Once likely declarants are known, the parties should confer as to dates for scheduling all depositions related to the revised MTAs after the relevant papers will be filed. The Board expects parties to make their declarants available for such depositions promptly, and to make their attorneys available to take and defend such depositions; any unavailability will not be a reason to adjust the schedule for briefing on a revised MTA absent extraordinary circumstances.

If Petitioner submits a declaration with its opposition to a revised MTA, or Patent Owner submits a declaration with its reply to that opposition, the party should typically make such declarant available for deposition within 1 week after filing that declaration. As needed, the parties may wish to agree to shortened periods for making objections and serving supplemental evidence prior to a deposition. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.53(d)(2), 42.64(a) and (b). In the absence of such an agreement, the parties shall schedule such depositions in advance of a due date for serving supplemental evidence. If, after receiving supplemental evidence, a party believes in good faith that the supplemental evidence requires further cross-examination of a declarant, the party should contact the Board for a conference call. Again, it is incumbent upon the parties to work cooperatively to schedule depositions

of their declarants. Thus, the Board strongly encourages the parties to meet and confer as soon as practicable (including before anticipated declarations are submitted, if possible) to coordinate schedules.

Because Patent Owner's replies and Petitioner's sur-replies as to the revised MTAs are due near or after motions to exclude are due, the parties might not have an opportunity to object to evidence submitted with the reply or sur-reply and file a motion to exclude such evidence before the oral hearing. *See* 37 § C.F.R. 42.64. Thus, if needed, a party may seek authorization to file a motion to exclude reply or surreply evidence after the oral hearing or may make an oral motion to exclude and argue such a motion at the oral hearing.

B. DUE DATES

This Order sets due dates for the parties to take action by DUE DATE RMTA1 and after. The parties may stipulate different dates for DUE DATES RMTA1, RMTA2, 5, and 6 (earlier or later, but no later than DUE DATE 7). A notice of the stipulation, specifically identifying the changed due dates, must be promptly filed. The parties may not stipulate an extension of DUE DATES 4, 7, and 8.

In stipulating different times, the parties should consider the effect of the stipulation on times to object to evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(b)(1)), to supplement evidence (§ 42.64(b)(2)), to conduct cross-examination (§ 42.53(d)(2)), and to draft papers depending on the evidence and cross-examination testimony.

1. DUE DATE RMTA1

Petitioner may file an opposition to Patent Owner's revised MTA. Petitioner's opposition to the revised MTA may only respond to issues raised in the revised MTA or the preliminary guidance (if provided).

2. DUE DATE RMTA2

Patent Owner may file a reply to Petitioner's opposition to the revised MTA. Patent Owner's reply to the opposition may only respond to issues raised in the opposition.

3. DUE DATE 5

Either party may file a motion to exclude evidence (37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c)).

4. DUE DATE 6

Either party may file an opposition to a motion to exclude evidence.

Either party may request that the Board hold a pre-hearing conference.

5. DUE DATE 7

Either party may file a reply to an opposition to a motion to exclude evidence.

Petitioner may file a sur-reply to Patent Owner's reply to the opposition to the revised MTA. Petitioner's sur-reply may only respond to issues raised in the reply to the opposition.

6. DUE DATE 8

The oral argument (if requested by either party) shall be held on this date. Approximately one month prior to the argument, the Board will issue an order setting the start time of the hearing and the procedures that will govern the parties' arguments.

REVISED DUE DATE APPENDIX

DUE DATE RMTA1 ..... 6/1/2026

Petitioner's opposition to Patent Owner's revised motion to amend

DUE DATE RMTA2 ..... 6/22/2026

Patent Owner's reply to opposition to revised motion to amend

DUE DATE 5 ..... 6/29/2026

Motion to exclude evidence

DUE DATE 6 ..... 7/6/2026

Opposition to motion to exclude

Request for prehearing conference

DUE DATE 7 ..... 7/13/2026

Reply to opposition to motion to exclude

Petitioner's sur-reply to reply to opposition to revised motion to amend

DUE DATE 8 ..... 7/20/2026

Oral argument (if requested)

FOR PETITIONER:

Chad Walters
Harrison Rich
Ellyar Barazesh
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
chad.walters@bakerbotts.com
harrison.rich@bakerbotts.com
ellyar.barazesh@bakerbotts.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Suhrid Wadekar
Matthew Vella
James Hall
PRINCE LOBEL TYE LLP
swadekar@princelobel.com
mvella@vellapatentservices.com
jhall@princelobel.com